

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 JOHN WILLIAM WALLACE,

No. C 11-80031 SI

9 Plaintiff,

ORDER ON PRE-FILING REVIEW

10 v.

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

12 Defendant.
13 _____/

14 Plaintiff John William Wallace has submitted for this Court's pre-filing review a complaint filed
15 against the United States. Upon review of the complaint, the Court finds that it fails to state any claim
16 against defendant and DISMISSES this action with prejudice.
17

18 **DISCUSSION**

19 Plaintiff filed a total of twelve actions against the United States in this district between March
20 and July of 2004, eight of which were filed *in forma pauperis*. All of the actions pertained to plaintiff's
21 effort to obtain "original title" to various parcels of real estate, some of which were outside California.
22 After orders of dismissal were entered in almost every case, the actions were eventually related and
23 assigned to the Honorable Fern Smith, a former judge of this district. The United States made a motion
24 for an order requiring pre-filing review of any future complaint submitted by plaintiff which named the
25 United States as a defendant. After holding a conference with the parties, Judge Smith granted the
26 United States' motion, finding that plaintiff had abused the *in forma pauperis* procedure by filing
27 multiple, duplicative lawsuits without disclosing his filing history, and that all of plaintiff's filings
28 were incoherent, frivolous, and not properly brought in federal court. Judge Smith ordered pre-filing

1 review “of any papers presented by John William Wallace for filing that name the United States as a
2 defendant.”


3 Now before the Court for pre-filing review is a complaint lodged on February 25, 2011, which
4 names the United States as defendant. The complaint is unintelligible. The complaint is headed “Non-
5 Payment Annuitant.” The complaint consists of streams of words separated by commas, semicolons or
6 colons. The stream begins with a list of words for forms of money or compensation (“Investments,
7 Interest, U.S. Currency, Legal, Tender, Awards, Grants, Notes, Bonds, Securities, Pay, Wages, Salary,
8 Stock, T Bills, Tips”). The complaint then lists a number of nationalities and jurisdictions (*e.g.*,
9 Cantonese, Hmong, Nebraska, Oregon), “All Investments in Black Pin” for various categories of
10 employees, a list of federal agencies and private companies, including the Department of Defense,
11 Environmental Protection Agency, and Exxon Mobil, followed by a list of commodities and elements
12 (*e.g.*, iron, uranium).

13 Plaintiff’s papers are plainly insufficient to allege any claim against the United States or any
14 other defendant. Plaintiff has made no attempt to allege a single fact or event, or even to explain what,
15 if anything, he is seeking through this lawsuit. There is no basis on which to find that any response to
16 plaintiff’s rambling and incoherent papers is warranted.

17 The complaint may not be filed and is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice. The clerk is directed
18 to close the case, and no further filings will be accepted in this action.

19
20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21
22 Dated: March 4, 2011

23 
24 SUSAN ILLSTON
25 United States District Judge
26
27
28